

Book Reviews

Book Review

Rade Kalanj

Globalizacija i postmodernost
(*Globalization and Postmodernity*)

Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2004, 235 pages

“I believe that it is impossible to conceive parts as parts without a cognitive unity, but I also believe that it is impossible to conceive the unity without *particular* cognition of parts” (p. 8). This Pascal’s thought in the preface of the book *Globalization and Postmodernity*, written by sociologist Rade Kalanj from Zagreb, has double function.

On the one hand, it represents a certain motto of all those whose key-ideas are presented in the book. The book with a suitable subtitle *Essays on Thinkers of Global Complexity* is composed of eight previously published, but for this occasion specially revised and supplemented author’s essays in which he expounded main theses of eminent social theoreticians of modernity. Having successfully crossed beyond the disciplinary limits in their research works, they confirmed that the Pascal’s meditation should not be taken for granted, as a mere “book reference”, but that it should be perceived as a relevant methodic instruction in analyzing modern global society.

On the other hand, the Pascal’s thought can be interpreted as a justification for publishing the book. Diversity of the presented authors, who are undoubtedly linked only by the dimension of social criticism and the label of the postmodern, in this case does not interfere with their joint presentation. On the contrary, the compilation such as this one is stimulating in the search after comprehension of complexity of modern social processes. As for the reader, confronted with presented diverse viewpoints he/she could detect for himself/herself “theoretical guidelines for thinking

and even for acting” (9) in the context of globalization.

The essays, which apart from reviews and interpretations of theses also offer basic biographical facts, are grouped into two parts. In the first part entitled *Development, Globalization and Relations of Domination* we are introduced with Amartya Sen, Edward W. Said, Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, Joseph E. Stiglitz and Jean Ziegler, while André Gorz, Michael Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu and Jean Baudrillard are presented in the second part with the title *The Knowledge and Power in the Postmodernist Perspective*. While the first group of essays are linked by the authors’ dealing with global capitalism and various aspects of relationship between the imperial West as the dominant center and its colonies as the subordinated peripheries, the linkage in the second group of essays, apart from the authors’ French citizenship and their being part of the postmodern intellectual sphere, is far more difficult to detect. It seems that the author, faced with this difficulty, decided to simply summarize the Foucault’s field of study in the title of the second group thus neglecting the other three thinkers. Even if this fact diminishes to a certain extent the aesthetical harmony of the book in its entirety, still it in no way lessens the scientific value of *separate parts* whose brief outline we shall give hereinafter, confining ourselves only to the basic facts about certain authors.

Economist Amartya Sen (Nobel Prize-winner for economy in 1999), the first of the presented authors, deserved the title of a thinker of global complexity when he stepped beyond the narrow limits of economism, i.e. the reducing of complex social processes into quantitative economic indicators. Taking into account a number of social parameters, he stressed that the growth of GDP or personal incomes should be rejected as the sole criteria of development as they do not necessarily lead to the increased living standard. Sen defined the development as an increase of freedom, differentiating *substantial freedoms* and *instrumental freedoms* (political freedoms, eco-

conomic privileges, welfare benefits, guarantees of transparency and protective security) and he proved how mutual strengthening of instrumental freedoms results in strengthening of substantial freedoms, i.e. it enables individuals to shape independently their lives worth of respect (e.g. public education as a welfare benefit results in increased level of literacy which in turn has a direct impact on increased responsible political participation and increased political freedoms).

Leaving aside well-known political and economic imperialism, Edward Said, Professor of Comparative Literature and cultural theoretician, dedicated the most of his work to the study of unjustifiably neglected cultural dimension of imperialism. Known for the book *Orientalism* in which he defined the Orient as a fantastic construct tailored by the West, Said analyzed the construction of the colonial world as a cultural periphery. Even though prejudices of the West about the Islamic and other non-Western world are explicitly formulated in a number of places, Said decided to venture his deconstructive job in the novels in which “ideological beliefs have been masterly intertwined with highly aesthetical skill of prose discourse and thus they can be only detected by scrupulous critical reading of the text” (45). Introduction, which the author is offering us, with the controversial Said’s interpretation of the books of Joseph Conrad (*Heart of Darkness*), Rudyard Kipling (*Kim*) and Albert Camus (*The Stranger* and *The Plague*) as documents of the colonial dominance of the West will certainly have a strong impact on the reader.

In the third essay the author introduces us with the Antonio Negri’s, Italian Professor of politics, and Michael Hardt’s, Professor of Literature and Romance Philology, revolutionary and programmatic intonated book *Empire*, in which the authors tried to reveal the structure of the modern global order. They believe that by globalization of economic transactions a new order, an Empire, has been created as a decentred and deterritorialized form of rule. In contrast to a state, the empire has no boundaries, at least not in conceptual terms. The Empire is an unquestionable force that wages wars against barbarians and rebels from

within, and its power is spreading all over the civilized world. Creation of the Empire implies the end of sovereignty of national states. Even though the United States of America are accused by many of being such an empire, they are not; there is no center of the new imperial world order. Inspired by Foucault, but objecting his confining himself to the limits of structuralistic epistemology, Hardt and Negri explained the functioning of the new imperial government by the concepts of *biopower* and *biopolitics* with a special emphasis on the role of transnational companies in biopolitical structurization of the world. In their utopian finale, they place their hopes on activating of a great revolutionary potential which lies in the multitude of the exploited by the Empire who have the opportunity to be transformed into the global citizenship, a global anti-empire movement.

The last essay in the first group is dedicated to two experts employed in international institutions, which thus give more weight to their analyses. American economist Joseph E. Stiglitz, a former chief economist with the World Bank and Nobel Prize-winner for economy in 2001, and Jean Ziegler, a Swiss sociologist and special referee of the UN Right on Nutrition, both of them thinkers of global complexity beyond the limits of “professional hermetism” (86), criticize neoliberal politics which has been naturalized in the dogma of self-regulation of the market and “pronounces economic fatalism against which every resistance is futile” (93). Neoliberal model of reforms, deregulation and liberalization of all markets (of goods, services, capital and work), along with privatization and dismantlement of the public sector, which Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan began to implement in Great Britain and the USA at the beginning of the 1980’s, are being imposed to the entire world via IMF and the World Bank at the expense of underdeveloped countries. Thus in pressing their prescriptions, IMF experts did not recognize the social context of transition countries (erosion of social capital) which has produced catastrophic consequences (e.g. privatization process in Russia). In providing guidelines for solving global problems, level-headed Stiglitz suggests a reorganization of economy in terms of state interventions and

regulations of the bank system, then enhancement of security networks, increase of transparency etc., while Ziegler, a radical critic prone to use an emotionally charged vocabulary, finds the solution in social mobilization of the fronts that stand up against globalization (labor unions, peasant movements, women's rights movements, indigenous people, environmental movements and NGOs).

The other part begins with the committed left-oriented French intellectual André Gorz who established the end of the proletariat and labor society. According to his notions, decreased working intensity of new technologies has led to a situation in which there is no need for full employment in order to achieve full production, which in turn results with surplus workers. In the world in which full employment has become scarce and the number of agreed-upon business deals continues to rise, the collective power of the labor force is diminishing and thus there is a greater possibility of exploitation. This exploitation is the product of globalization which Gorz perceives as a liberal fraud, as an outcome of successfully waged war of the capital against the labor. As a solution, Gorz offers a utopian project of a *post-wage based society*, a *multi-activity* society in which the working time no longer forms dominant social time in which ever lesser scope of work is being distributed to an increasing number of workers and free time and different artistic, scientific, environmental and sport activities become an offset of a new type of sociability.

The review of the Michael Foucault's work is based on his analysis of the power and problems as outlined in his book *Les mots et les choses* (1966). The Kalanj's essay was originally the afterword of the Croatian edition of the book. Foucault is given credit for encouraging sociologists to reexamine a number of fundamental concepts which "...the routine discursive practice has consumed and even deprived of any sense" (140). The author introduces us first with the Foucault's "intellectual sphere": he categorizes him into the paradigm of structuralism, he emphasizes the decisive influence of Nietzsche and explains his post-structuralist metamorphosis as criticism of metaphysics of the subject. Foucault analyses

the archeology of structures that administer the discourse in certain periods and he identifies three epistemological orders: renaissance, classicism and modernity. Analyzing the power, Foucault starts "from the bottom up", from micro-sociological structures. He perceives the power to be "capillary", decentred; it is neither in the hands of a sovereign nor the ruling class. The power is a complex strategic situation in a society; "it is everywhere because it comes from everywhere". The Foucault's detachment from the classical approach is exemplified in his attitude towards the Hobbes's *Leviathan*. He is not interested in the problem of sovereignty, "the central soul" of the *Leviathan* made up by unification of many other, but instead he wishes to study "peripheral and numerous bodies, the bodies that are constituted as subjects, which is due to the effects of power" (148). In this context, of special interest is the Foucault's analysis of power in modern societies which are characterized by control and discipline of population whereby power and knowledge are closely linked and they produce one another.

Having arrived to the elite *L'École normale supérieure* Pierre Bourdieu was confronted with his bourgeois colleagues who could fluently and in a relaxed manner express in intellectual terms impressive (even though substantially inane) thoughts on just about everything. Bourdieu as a "provincial of humble origins" thus felt himself socio-cultural inferiority. The essay on this renowned French sociologist, the author of a great number of theoretical writings, but also a writer of various committed works, Kalanj justifiably begins with a biographical introduction. Namely, it was precisely the experience of cultural expression of class domination that became the focal point of his theoretical elaborations, which is expressed e.g. in terms such as cultural capital and symbolic violence. With theses on the cultural capital as a "set of goods of symbolic nature which are inherited from one's own social environment, such as having the mastery of a language, "good manners", social codes, refinement, diplomas, etc." (176), Bourdieu amplified the reductionist image of bare economic domination in the capitalist order. Intellectually molded under the Marxist, structuralist and Durkheimian influence, but

also the influence of Elias and Wittgenstein, Bourdieu established a standpoint that can be called *structuralist constructivism*: objective structures independent of the consciousness and will of the actor according to his theory are complementary to the activities of the actor, individual and collective struggles which aspire after a change or preservation of these structures. Because of his criticism of the school system which functions as a stratification mechanism through which the dominant class is being reproduced, criticism of the neoliberal politics which is hiding behind the fatalism of economic rules, criticism of the mass media and especially television which by promoting populist sensationalism make the public more and more stupid, criticism of the intellectualism itself as it only grasps the action “from the outside and at an angle” not taking heed of the relation of the actor towards its own action, some circles ridiculed the Bourdieu’s thinking as a “proletarian intellectualism” (186). However, there is no denying of his being a stimulating thinker of global complexity.

The last essay deals with Jean Baudrillard whom the author presents as the most attractive representative of the post-modernist circle, as a “phenomenon Baudrillard”. According to the author’s interpretation, Baudrillard is not only convincing on the surface as there is a firm theoretical background behind the façade of his bombastic hypertrophied rhetoric. Baudrillard analyzes production, trade and consumption in the post-industrialist, communication and media reality. He deals with political economy, but “... under altered circumstances of overwhelming domination of image, computer signs and media occupation of the reality” (194). In his view, the postmodern world is characterized by division of signs from their referential sources – simulacra, images, descriptions, projections are being formed that have no other footing in the reality but themselves. “We actually live in the world of simulacra where an image or a determinant of an action substitutes a direct experience and knowledge on its footing and on the marked” (202). Therefore, those who nowadays antagonize labor and capital in the old-fashioned manner, referring thus to a conflict of the industrialist era, are trapped in the anachronistic

thinking which cannot realize that in the altered reality of the simulacra order it sinks into “false radicalism with no referentiality” (212).

In keeping with the Pascal leitmotiv, we can conclude that the Kalanj’s book provides comprehension of the parts and the whole alike. Certain parts of the book form an excellent introduction into further reading of any of the presented authors, while the book in its entirety gives a satisfactory insight into the intellectual scenery of postmodernity. It is a satisfactory one, but not complete because, as the author himself acknowledges, a complete insight should include many other authors such as Immanuel Wallerstein, Anthony Giddens, Ulrich Beck, Zygmunt Bauman and Ralf Dahrendorf. One should not criticize too severely the author’s omission of these thinkers. We can forgive the author for this drawback, which he himself stressed and acknowledged, and we can recommend the book unreservedly. Either in its entirety or at least certain parts of the book.

Krešimir Petković

Book Review

Davor Rodin

*Predznaci postmoderne
(Foretaste of the Postmodern)*

Fakultet političkih znanosti, Zagreb,
2004, 293 pages

“Walking along the great prospect of our town, in my mind I am erasing all the elements which I had decided not to take into consideration... The world is so complicated, intricate and crammed so that a man, if he wants to see better, has to dilute and dilute over and over again.”

It is not a very common thing to begin a review of the book from the field of philosophy of politics with a quotation from a fiction book, but in this specific case there is a more than satisfactory justification for doing so. The

reason for it lies not only in the fact that the author himself in his book on several occasions refers to Italo Calvino and quotes his novel *If on a Winter's Night A Traveler*, from which the opening quotation is taken from, and in the fact that the author begins some of chapters in his book with quotations from the Calvino's book. The reason lies in the fact that the mentioned quotation from the Calvino's postmodern novel¹ can give an adequate and brief outline of the author's political thought.

Namely, the author in his new book *Foretaste of the Postmodern* gave an outline of the reconstruction of research paradigm in political science, forming his viewpoint primarily on the considerations of German sociologist Niklas Luhmann, whose idea of reduction of complexity is lucidly expressed in the opening quotation. As it is well known, Luhmann leveled his criticism against positivistic tradition in social sciences. He disenchanted its constitutive elements of causal and teleological explanation as just some of the techniques of the reduction of complexity, a compulsory task for each entity that wishes to remain viable in the world of infinite complexity and unpredictability. Luhmann deprived causality of a metaphysical quality which it had and transformed it into a construct of a system, just a two-level heuristic thought scheme on the basis of which the system reveals alternatives by determining in the first place certain items in the environment as causes or effects and then by evaluating certain effects as desirable and thus setting up its sphere of action. In such interpretation the issue of "truth" or "essence" of purposes has become pointless. By re-conceptualization of social theory as a theory of system, Luhmann simply replaced the traditional ontological problem area with the issue of *function* of purposes by which the system defines its problem of existence. From the Luhmann's perspective scientific notables such as Marx, Darwin, Nietzsche and Freud are just "great sophists from the 19th century" as they explained purposes in their theories by

factors that are beyond the human perceptible horizon, e.g. by reducing them into ideology or rationalization.²

In the same way, Rodin in *Foretaste of the Postmodern* came forward against "dualistic ontologism of modern-history" (p. 112), rejecting each attempt of explaining phenomena in some social sphere with phenomena of some other social sphere. Instead, he adopted the Luhmann's theory of autopoietic systems which endeavor to remain viable in a complex and changing environment, as systems which are independent from their environment in causal and teleological terms, which means that the environment cannot change them directly, but only irritate them in semantic terms whereas the system will react to its stimuli according to the rules of their own structure.³

Rodin deduced several conclusions relevant for political science from aforementioned general epistemological premises. The first conclusion refers to the subject of study of political science. The political system is autonomous. It is separated from other social systems (economic, legal, religious, moral, scientific). There are neither causal nor teleological relations between them: they are "incommensurable media of action", which they, according to Rodin, also "must be" (208). The second conclusion refers to the role of political science. Its task, as a part of the scientific system, is to observe political actors. As "an observer from the second row", political science should transpose political action in a logical-grammatical media. At the meta-theoretical level,

² Luhmann, Niklas: *Teorija sistema: svrhovitost i racionalnost (Zweckbegriff und Systemsrationalität)*, Globus, Zagreb, p. 123.

³ Luhmann took the concept of autopoiesis from biology. The concept was originally developed by Chilean neurologists Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela. In biology, the theory of autopoiesis is in a direct inconsistency with the phenomenon of viruses that are capable to graft their program directly into a living cell which then reproduces them, without reprocessing according to the rules of its own structure. See: Viskovatoff, Alex, 1999: *Foundations of Niklas Luhmann's Theory of Social Systems, Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, (29) 4.

¹ Calvino, Italo, 2004: *Ako jedne zimske noći neki putnik (If on a Winter's Night a Traveler)*, Biblioteka Jutarnjeg lista XX. stoljeće, Globus, Zagreb, p. 205, free translation from Croatian

political scientists “as observers from the third row” should monitor their scientific activities which they perform as observers from the second row. Naturally, in this process the relationship between the levels is not causal, but semantic and communicative.

The third for political science relevant conclusion of the author’s viewpoint is a revised writing of the history of political thought from the perspective of a new paradigm. Namely, as one of key topics of the book Rodin has offered an entirely original interpretation of the history of political ideas, dividing it into three stages. Representatives of the first stage, which he calls *political philosophy*, are Plato and Aristotle. They made a step forward from mythological tradition to which they opposed a consideration that a good political life is only the one that can be logically explained in the grammatical medium of language. The second stage is the modern-history *political theory* represented by Hobbes, Spinoza, Kant and Hegel. It equated scientific mind with political practice and tried to govern the political life *more geometrico*.

The third stage, which the author favors distancing himself from the two mentioned traditions, is contemporary *political thinking*. This thought proceeds from a new existential situation in which the mankind found itself. It is a situation in which we are constantly faced with new unexpected revelations (*Ereignisse*) and unanticipated resistance in the environment. If we paraphrase the opening quotation, we can state that the prospect of our town has become so overwhelmed with various elements that we constantly run into them without even being aware of existence of many of them and knowing even less when and how they will take us by surprise.

Structures of the old metaphysics – grammar and causality – are not always perceived as an adequate tool for solving problems brought by the new situation in which we find ourselves. Therefore, the task of political thought is to raise the consciousness of *selective blindness*, taking a critical view of the two previous traditions. In contrast to political philosophy, political thought thus realizes that language is not a means of revealing truth, but just one of the media that has its own structure

on the basis of which it processes and produces information. Each medium is incommensurable with other medium and thus the identity of the picture in the medium with that what is being displayed is unfeasible.⁴ By applying this postulate onto the sphere which the political thought is dealing with one can deduce that “... a grammatical description of a political act is not a political act itself” (4), but rather its stylization in other medium.

In contrast to modern-history traditions of political theory, whose selective blindness is far more dangerous, political thought avoids reckless rationalization of politics, which can result in absolute dementia. For political thought, the well-known Hegel’s statement: “What is rational, it is real and what is real is rational” thus becomes a futile panoptical illusion, a dangerous pretension on absolute truthfulness of one’s own story that fails to discern a concept from unpredictable reality (256). Rodin also rates Habermas among the representatives of this tradition: in the third chapter of the book entitled “A book lives as long as it is being written and as long as it is being read”, in which the author expounds the Habermas’ book *Faktizität und Geltung*, Rodin explains in detail the thesis according to which Habermas is a metaphysician of the old style as with his theory of communicative action he ignores the autonomy of the political phenomenon by perceiving in it a facticity suitable for colonization on the basis of normative validity.

Concluding the presentation on paradigms of political thought, it should be pointed out that the proposed classification must not be perceived as a restricted one, as a series of chronologically successive stages, because, as the author himself points out, all three “stages” exist concurrently today as well. They appear time after time, coming up in new and altered hermeneutical situations which Rodin defines with the term *reentry*. Furthermore, a special emphasis is given in the book on the fact that

⁴ Once at the lecture, Rodin wittily noticed that a child caught lying should not be punished, but awarded because by lying it shows that it can perceive the logical-grammatical structure of the spoken medium.

parallel with this stages there is an always present natural state that cannot be eradicated to the full extent. This state can be discerned in original phenomena such as love, hatred, friendship and hospitality which all evade legal regulation. From this perspective it becomes completely clear why it is naïve to talk about the end of history with a liberal-democratic state and why Francis Fukuyama is “an amateur political-scientist” (168).

We have tried so far to synthesize in general outline the author’s theoretical and methodological standpoint which connects and forms the backbone of all sixteen essays-chapters of the book. This standpoint of the author is dispersedly presented in each chapter.⁵ Before we give an outline of some of specific issues which the author deals with within the described analytical framework, we should also mention some other thinkers apart from Luhmann who paved the way for postmodern paradigm, which is why the author devotes a considerable space to them in the book. In the first place, these are the “pioneers of the post-modern” who had made an immense effort to identify something about which Luhmann could easily speak afterwards (24). The first of them, Husserl, replaced the issue on the essence of a being with the issue of the purpose of a being thus putting an emphasis of philosophical research on the meaning which phenomena have for consciousness. The other one, Wittgenstein, anticipated an unutterable reality about which one can only be silent as it is beyond the speech limits. The last of the great three, Heidegger, drew the attention to the oblivion of a being which eludes a routine, stereotyped existence as well as the traditional metaphysics that conceals it. Apart from their notions, Rodin also acknowledged epistemological notions of Thomas Kuhn and Paul Feyerabend who established that scientific theories are not being developed one upon the other in succession, but that they can exist concurrently and irritate one another in se-

mantic terms. Finally, we should also single out Carl Schmitt who, according to the Rodin’s criteria, can also be rated among the representatives of the postmodern political thought as he realized that the phenomenon of the political has an autonomous existence and is not susceptible to scientific rationalization.

Rodin elaborated the project of the change of paradigm by giving examples of certain problems and topical issues in certain chapters of the book. To begin with, we shall point to the sixth chapter in which the author outlined how changes occurred in crucial social systems – economic and political – reminding us, naturally, how they have autonomous structures, their own inner differentiation and techniques of coping with complexity. The author based his analysis of the process in the first sphere on the Erich Weede’s book *Wirtschaft, Staat und Gesellschaft* and in the second sphere on the Klaus von Beyme’s book *Die politische Klasse im Parteistaat*. In these books the authors described the processes which provoke crises in both systems. According to Weede, the market competition in the first system has been transformed into activities of *rent-seeking*, into a search after extra-profits which are acquired in the first place by monopolization of innovations on the strength of their legal protection. On the other hand, the political system has not responded adequately to these changes. In this system, according to Beyme, a party cartel has been formed which is expressed in a condensed manner by the sentence: “*Modern parties act on their own behalf*”. The political class has distanced itself from the electoral body which in turn has been transformed since the World War II into an atomized mass of “people without characteristics” and without defined interests. Political parties have contact with disinterested voters only through attempts of mobilization in the electoral year while at the same time they secure their survival on political positions by a mutual consensus. (In the same chapter, “A rent seeking society, pluralism and justice”, Rodin offered at the end an interpretation of the Rawls’ ideas from the “Political liberalism” perceiving *fairness* as a pragmatic solution for co-existence of incommensurable options that are placed into an interrelation of semantic irritation.)

⁵ For a more detailed outline of the categorial apparatus which the author uses, see: Rodin, Davor, 2000: *Glosar novijeg društveno-znanstvenog pojmovlja* (Glossary of Contemporary Concepts of Social Science), *Politička misao*, (37) 4.

Worth mentioning is also the author's postmodern revision of the concepts of the public and democracy from the previous, fifth chapter which he bases on the thesis that speech is not ruled by grammatical, ontological and traditional pre-structures. On the contrary, Rodin believes that speech is comprehensible only in connection with certain activity as the use of speech precedes any formalism, e.g. grammatical rules which only subsequently rise to the level of explicit consciousness and it is in this context that he quotes the Wittgenstein's gloss: "I follow the rule blindly" (*Philosophical Investigations*, § 219). Proceeding from this notion, Rodin points to the problem of communication among different incommensurable cultures in the postmodern public. When democracy is concerned, Rodin emphasizes that the democratic procedure has to face constantly the uncertainty of the will of the people who will, in the Rodin's view, always remain a "multi-headed monster".

In the ninth chapter entitled "Morality with no commands", Rodin offered a new interpretation of moral action from the perspective of system theory and responsive phenomenology. The moral action in a new hermeneutic situation cannot be a routine thing. It is now being perceived as an identification of unmarked spots in which there are no fixed answers and it is defined in the first place by uncertainty of comprehension of the other person with whom we are establishing communication.

Finally, the author also gave in the book a distinct interpretation of the American military intervention in Iraq (6, 87-95). He stressed that the fault of the U.S.A. was not in disregarding international law, but primarily in the lack of understanding of the postulate of the modern political thought. Namely, the USA failed to comprehend that Iraq is not a political community but rather by force linked ethnic and religious communities, i.e. that it concerns an incommensurable culture to which it is impossible to impose the Western liberal-democratic political system. However, we believe that the author exaggerated when he identified the subsequent military intervention as the "change of semantics" (6), as in our view in this way the concept of communication is overstretched

thus unjustifiably encompassing the American military arsenal of an ambiguous semantic nature.

These are few of some interesting issues which Rodin introduced in the first part of the book, comprising the first ten chapters. The last six chapters form the other part of the book which is substantially linked by the topical problems of the European integration. In the essays *Euro-skeptics and Euro-optimists*, *Europe: shell without core*, *The European Constitution: a step forward from theological legitimization of political system* and *Cultural-historical and political identity* Rodin dealt with European issues such as the European borders and debates between Euro-skeptics and Euro-optimists. From his "post-metaphysical" viewpoint, the author denounces the European identity as a non-existent core which we reach only when the shells are broken one by one, i.e. as a constructed fiction, an enactment which arises from the debate between Euro-skeptics and Euro-optimists that, unfortunately, quite often descends to the mythological level. Instead of insisting on cultural, historical or religious unity of Europe, Rodin advocates its political unity. In the author's view, establishment of the European *political* identity is the only reasonable alternative to attempted cultural, religious or ideological homogenization which could only damage beyond repair. In this sense, the European Constitution must in no way form a homogenizing constitution of a cosmopolitan super-state. Its basic role is to sort out the normative chaos and to harmonize the foundation agreements on the strength of which it could provide a framework for political co-existence and co-operation among European states and thus create a situation in which European political actors could be comprehensible to one another.

We have three smaller objections to the book, two of which are of a purely technical nature. Even though the essays had been published before, apart from the eleventh chapter there is no special mention of it which is also the fault of the editors. Furthermore, the frequency of misspelled English words exceeds the limit of one's tolerance. One of the striking examples of the failed English language-editing is turning the Feyerabend's slogan *any-*

thing goes into *anising goes* on page 25 and *enithing wents* on page 284. The other, probably greater problem lies in the fact that Rodin offers a quite free interpretation of certain authors, which can be detected from this review. We can wittily notice that, like Borg in the *Star Trek* who assimilates all other races with whom he establishes contact, by inserting different authors into the Rodin's stream of consciousness they are being removed from their authenticity and they are being transformed into the "Rodin's followers".

However, we are certain that the high quality of this book has not been questioned by these minor objections. Its value lies primarily in the fact that it emphasizes the selective blindness of positivistic standpoint. The author in no way argues for anarchism nor relativism, but he only sounds a note of caution, "abandoning autism" (35) and deliverance from the illusion of "complete transparency of reality" (82), which all represent indispensable precautionary measures in the modern hermeneutic situation in which we find ourselves. The author is nevertheless aware of the fact that the perspective which he argues in favor of is also just another new type of the selective blindness (270), and he does not aspire to reach conclusive solutions to the problem nor to give the final shape of the paradigmatic change. Therefore we believe that the title of the book – *Foretaste of the Postmodern* – stuck the right note.

If we go back to the opening quotation at the very end of this review, we can state that nowadays it is left to the consciousness of each individual to decide what elements from the prospect of his/her town he/she will take into account and what elements he/she will omit and to assess afterwards what consequences the adoption of such viewpoint will have (in this case it concerns the Rodin's project of parting from the postmodern). In order to be capable to do it responsibly, every individual should gather preliminary information on various current conceptions. In this sense we therefore invite you, by abiding the vocabulary of the book, to be thoroughly irritated in semantic terms by the *Foretaste of the Postmodern* in order to get acquainted with another interesting and in thoughtful terms stimulating

paradigmatic option offered on the rich epistemological menu of modern social sciences.

Krešimir Petković

Book Review

Ivan Prpić (ed.)

Globalizacija i demokracija
(*Globalization and Democracy*)

Fakultet političkih znanosti, Zagreb,
2004, 188 pages

At the end of 2002, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Faculty of Political Science in Zagreb, a scientific conference on globalization was held. Contributions presented at the Conference were published by the publisher *Biblioteka Politička misao* in the form of proceedings entitled *Globalization and Democracy*. The proceedings consist of fourteen papers that refer to various aspects of globalization. The majority of the papers deal with the impact of globalization on traditional functions of a national state, the lack of democratic legitimacy of new emerging global actors and governing possible unitary global order.

Ivan Prpić, editor of the Proceedings and Professor of Political Theory at the Faculty of Political Science, identifies globalization in the foreword as a twofold phenomenon: as a *process* "by which a historically new type of system of manifold relations and interpenetration among and within states and societies, which form modern world system, is being established" (1), and as an *order* "which is being established by the globalization process" (2), whose main subjects are transnational corporations. Prpić stresses furthermore that globalization is being justified by the "values of classical liberalism" that are most often interpreted in the way which suits "new subjects of the process" and which are "not general, even though they should be accepted and acknowledged by all the mankind". Finally, Prpić

draws the attention to the three peculiarities of changes caused by globalization: deficit of democratic legitimacy, prevailing of state as one of fundamental modern political subjects and necessity of radical changes of objects as well as of examining methodology of political science research.

Davor Rodin, Professor of Political Philosophy at the Faculty of Political Science, in his paper "Globalism or a Journey to a New Division of the Globe" offers in a many ways challenging angle of analyzing globalization. The author perceives globalization as a process which leads to destruction of present spatio-temporal categories of notion of the world and establishment of the present as the only relevant framework of action. "Immediate transparency of each place in any time compels us to act with immediacy and to make decisions here and now with no protection of grammar censorship, with no interspace between cause and consequence, purpose and goal because concurrent events have neither cause-and-effect nor purposeful connection" (9). The new logic-semantic paradigm of the globalized world, which makes traditional horizons of certainty an insufficient criterion of man's orientation and exchanges it with immediate perception of the present, is inseparable from transformation of classical determinants of national state. Territory and tradition, political equivalents of logical categories of space and time have no longer existential potential in the man's political survival. As hinted by the title of the paper, the author believes that a new division of the globe is under way, or as he puts it, establishment of new boundaries "*diagonally* over existing rivers and mountains, religious and historical traditions of world nations" (11). In other words, globalization can be interpreted as a process of "ex-territorialization and ex-temporalization of national state" (7) and establishment of new semantic and communication relations among the differences that can no longer be covered by traditional theories which interpret globalism as the, in cosmopolitan terms, radicalized modern (Enlightenment and Hegel's philosophy of history, theories of capitalist integration of the world inspired by Marx, theories of the *technopole*). At the end, Rodin believes that democracy is indispensable as the foundation of

legitimacy and as an activity that "defines collective goods of certain political community" (26) even "in the sphere of the new postterritorial-temporal division of global sources of life" (27), even though he does not mention any concrete model of global democracy. Thus it remains unclear in what way democracy can accomplish set tasks if globalization is perceived as a process which leads to the new division of the world, independent of spatiotemporal differentiations.

T. Meyer, F. Cerutti, C. Offe and M. Podunavac deal in different ways in their papers with the problem of legitimacy under conditions of globalization. Thomas Meyer, renowned German political scientist and social democratic activist, points to inadequacy of the mechanism of national state to the challenges of globalization due to which democracy, which is "still in the sphere of national state...", becomes progressively weaker and, ultimately, questionable in its own basic demands" (29). The crisis of legitimacy at the national and global level necessitates invention of a global model of democracy (32). Presenting advantages and drawbacks of the so far known models of global governance, demarchy, cosmopolitan democracy, subsidiary world republic, the author argues in favor of their realistic synthesis in the model of open method of global coordination. This model is, among other things, based on the concept of new cosmopolitan citizenship, "bringing global economy within the effective boundaries of political responsibility" (41), some form of supranational political authority, but not a world republic, multi-layered government, open goals and functional solutions and finally a global civil society.

In contrast to this, F. Cerutti proposes a "multilateral international order based on creation of sub-continental unions of states, as envisaged by the theory of *new regionalism*" (105). However, Cerutti is not dealing with organizational characteristics of such union, but taking the EU as an example he examines the possibility of establishment of political identity as a condition of its legitimacy. In this context, he defines the political identity as a set of "values and principles which may, but does not necessarily have to include compre-

hensive notions of the world (*Weltbilder*), but at any rate it implies a common perception of history, on the basis of which we recognize ourselves as 'us' (106). Political identity gives to members of certain community a "sense that they have enough things in common so that they should obey the rules set by common institutions. Thus they perceive loyalty and participation as meaningful in regard to their common symbolic and normative sphere" (107). Apart from its being a prerequisite of legitimacy of some political order, identity is also a consequence of efficiency of its institutions, but only from the moment when "common values and conceptions" become well-established and when "they start to have an impact on lives of everyone in an efficient way comprehensible to everyone" (108). The author thinks that in the case of the EU, as a representative example of a sub-continental union, there cannot be talk of some variant of national nor supranational identity, but rather he calls possible future identity of the EU meta-national, even though he does not explain what its characteristics and contents would be like. He nevertheless stresses the fact that this identity must be unique, but that it will not undermine national and regional identities. Furthermore, the author also draws the attention to the fact that in the case of lack of such identity, there is a danger that the EU will be perceived by its citizens as a "mere functional entity efficient in regulating the market, money and borders" (109), but with no symbolic foundation and that due to this fact the citizens of the EU could react with "new tribalism", i.e. resorting to a self-contained and defiant image of a local or ethnic community" (109). The author's conclusion is thus incomprehensible (when we take into account his definition of political identity) when he states that the European identity will be established by the very fact that "we are all subjected to the same rules", that "we are promoters (as voters) and addressees (as citizens of a community that is no longer voluntaristic)" (111).

Claus Offe also points to the difficulties in establishing the European identity. He believes that the institutional structure itself cannot be a sufficient guarantee of stability and progress of liberal-democratic systems, but that a "set of moral resources" is indispensable and it com-

prises "tolerance, confidence and solidarity" (120). Efficiency of these moral resources on the other hand depends on the sense of common affiliation which the members of certain political community share. "If I can perceive my co-citizens as 'compatriots', an ever present temptation to betray the demands of tolerance, confidence and solidarity is thus diminished." Setbacks of liberal democracies ensue from this because "political liberalism advocates rights and freedoms of *individuals*", who are "perceived as *human beings*, and not as compatriots. It represents a morally demanding, perhaps even heroic position: recognition of the other without assistance of an assumed closeness, similarity or common identity" (121), which is especially evident in a large and heterogeneous community such as the EU. Like Cerutti, Offe finds an alternative to the liberal democratic position in a communitarian demand for group rights. According to his view, this alternative is dangerous as it leads to a dynamics of potential conflict and fear (123) characterized by a greater intensity than a conflict stirred by demands for other rights (political, social, etc.) because in the case of group rights "there is no umbrella-identity nor common nation which serve to restrain a conflict" (123). Therefore, although aware of the difficulties with which liberal democracies are faced with regarding representation of heterogeneous identities, Offe believes that "even the most demanding and most utopian version of liberal universalism and individualism" (126) is more suitable for preservation of political unity than recognition of group identities.

Tension between universal character of human rights and normative imperative of order (sovereignty) is analyzed in the paper of Milan Podunavac, Professor at the Faculty of Political Science in Belgrade, entitled "Citizenship and Democracy in the Global Era". The author's main thesis is that the tension is lessened as the globalization process weakens national states and questions the fiction of "closed society". Besides, globalization "integrates people more and more into a system of associations which are outside and beyond the area of a national state" (84), i.e. it integrates them into a global civil society. In the author's view, this society is not only a corrective, but also a "structural element of modern democ-

racy” (84). Due to all this, none of the two known, static principles of citizenry (*jus soli*, *jus sanguinis*) are not adequate to justify (legitimize) theory and practice of democratic citizenry” (83), and thus in the modern era its essence must be sought in the ideal of public mind (sense). The minimum substance of this ideal is that “a citizen must justify his/her political intentions in terms which his/her (co-)citizens understand and accept as congruent to their status of free and equal citizens” (83).

Economic aspects of globalization are treated in the papers presented by D. Strpić, V. Gligorov and Z. Baletić. The Baletić’s paper only indirectly refers to the problems of globalization through the interpretation of the Adam Smith’s economic theory, by which the author tries to prove that the Smith’s teaching does not lead to the market fundamentalism, i.e. that “a radical *laissez-faire* spirit is far from the spirit, but also from a single letter of the entire Smith’s work” (158). Vladimir Gligorov, economist at the Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies, tries to divide liberal political philosophy from neo-liberalistic practical politics and to show how the first one does not necessarily result in the other one. However, the author believes in the end that neo-liberalism is a doctrine which, apart from certain drawbacks that can be eliminated, is the most adequate for integration of the world economic order.

The paper of Dag Strpić, Professor of Political Economy at the Faculty of Political Science, with the title “Globalization and Democracy: Problem of Common Denominator” needs to be singled out. In this work, the author emphasizes the need to reconstruct the analytical instruments and to establish a new paradigm of political economy as imposed by globalization processes. New global political economy should develop into a “certain aspectual but comprehensive political science on a small scale” (52) for which process, apart from the usual instruments of political science, some other elements are needed. Strpić suggests four such elements: “classical Hobbes’s notion of commonwealth as a political-economic community” (52), perception of the world system as a political-economic unity comprised of nation-states and the world mar-

ket in a productive combination with national markets, comprehension of global political-economic cycles and “perception of institutional, business and political strategies of development with a footing in the entirety of public policies as a harmonized policy of development” (53). This paper is also interesting for a presented thesis according to which a centralized globalization system is not possible, i.e. that the globalization as we know today must fail (54), even though the author does not expound this thesis. Nevertheless, he points to the fact that globalization has been successful in other ways, and primarily in weakening democratization moment of nation-states and “weakening of efficiency of its public policies” (54).

Inge Perko, Professor of Public Administration at the Faculty of Political Science, deals with the impact of globalization on the public sector using the example of so-called new public management in her paper *Globalization and Democracy: Paradoxes of New Public Management*. New public management is a model of reforms of the public sector which, in the author’s view, is the outcome of globalization and it is to a large extent similar to the British and Washington model implemented by M. Thatcher and R. Reagan. New public management is formed on the basis of “neo-liberal economic principles and it subjects the scale, role and structure of the public sector to a critical analysis”. The author presents many reasons due to which she perceives this model as an adequate one for the reform of public administration: turning citizens into consumers and turning civil servants into entrepreneurs, motivated exclusively by the logics of market rewards, and not by the quality of services; demand for an enlarged autonomy of managers and managers’ competence blurs the political responsibility and the aim of reducing the role of state in the public sector for the accomplishment of which a strong state is indispensable. Apart from this, empirical results also do not support new public management. Namely, no increased efficiency was recorded in the places where new public management was implemented. Besides, the basic values of democracy are also jeopardized: responsibility, justice and equality along with concurrent increase of corruption and weak-

ening of local government (90). As opposed to new public management, the author stresses the advantages of the Swedish *welfare* model, which is characterized over a short term by governing on the basis of results and, over a long term, by strategic planning and strategic management “in a decentralized context of enlarged districts” (91). Her basic conclusion is that globalization will not result in the uniformity of administrative systems as they are deeply rooted into political culture of certain states (92) and that self-organized and self-controlled regionally and globally connected systems are a much more desirable aspect of globalization and a greater chance for preservation of democracy from hierarchically imposed structures.

John Groom, Professor of International Relations at the University of Kent, also shares this opinion. He perceives the global governance as a decentralized, multipolar process in which all the relevant actors partake with a stronger role of the global civil society through global conferences of the UN. The main obstacle to strengthening and formalizing this process lies, in the author’s view, in tension between human needs and existing institutions, i.e. in alienation of individual from democratic processes, even in mature democracies.

The Proceedings also include the papers of: Igor Primorac (“Globalization, Patriotism and Ethics”), in which the author presents arguments against moral value and compulsion of patriotism and he offers cosmopolitanism as an alternative; Goran Gretić (“Peace in Philosophy and Among Nations”) who tries to establish parallels between philosophical and political peace; Nadja Aleksandrova Arbatova (“Globalization and Democracy: the Case of Russia”) and a pessimistically intoned presentation of Zdravko Tomac (“Global Democracy opposite Global Dictatorship of Capital”) who conceives globalization as an uncontrolled process of gaining complete control over man which is presented as a culmination of his freedom.

In conclusion, we can repeat that the proceedings *Globalization and Democracy* include presentations which try to explain theoretically such a complex phenomenon as globalization from perspective of various disci-

plines. The majority of authors argue in favor of new political, economic and administrative models and scientific instruments which can confront the challenges of globalization because the existing ones are inadequate. Due to all this, these proceedings represent a valuable contribution to comprehension of globalization processes and an informative literature to all politically interested citizens and the topicality of the proceedings will be reaffirmed time and again.

Domagoj Vujeva

Book Review

Tihomir Cipek, Josip Vrandečić (eds.)

Hrestomatija liberalnih ideja u Hrvatskoj
(*Chrestomathy of Liberal Ideas in Croatia*)

Disput, Zagreb, 2004, 384 pages

Chrestomathy of Liberal Ideas in Croatia is the first serious insight into the history of liberal political thought in the territory of the present-day Croatia as its study has been neglected so far. It is preceded by “Liberal Thought in Croatia” (“Liberalna misao u Hrvatskoj”), a publication of collected essays on 22 liberal thinkers in Croatia in the 19th and 20th century published by Friedrich Naumann Foundation in 2000. *Chrestomathy of Liberal Ideas in Croatia* is thus a sort of an extension of the aforementioned publication, all the more so as the book is published with the support of the same Foundation.

The book is divided into three larger parts: the introductory treatise of the editors and Hans George Fleck, Head of the Friedrich Naumann Foundation’s Office in Zagreb, while the subject matter refers to the 19th century with subsections on Civil Croatia (Banošina Hrvatska), Dalmatia and Istria and to the 20th century. The editors Tihomir Cipek, political scientist at the Faculty of Political Sci-

ence in Zagreb, and Josip Vrandečić, historian at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zadar, tried to present in their choice of original texts all thematic fields of liberal thought, such as human and political rights, separation of powers, political representation and market economy, and thus the choice includes, apart from a brief biographical note on each thinker, texts of various profiles: from pieces of highly theoretical value (Pucić, Matoš, Gotovac...) to liberal political speeches (Mažuranić, Nodilo, Laginja...). Due to the “small force of Croatian liberalism” (12), some liberal articles of thinkers whose thought in its entirety do not correspond to the value concept of liberalism are also included, such as Strossmayer, Starčević and Radić.

In the first introductory treatise “Liberalism – Ideology of Freedom”, Cipek gives an accurate summary of main determinants of liberalism. In contrast to the mediaeval scholastic image of a man restrained by fear of the original sin, liberalism lays the foundations for a free individual in inalienable natural rights, the exercise of which under conditions of free market trade should lead to a linear development of the mankind. In order to establish such a society of freely acting individuals, on the basis of rational communication the rule of law is being established as an instrument of protection of human freedoms: right to life, property right, search after happiness..., so that the original liberalism introduces educational and property census and the principle of separation of powers as an instruments of protection of individual freedom from the abuse of the state authority and possible tyranny of the majority. Only the J. S. Mill’s political theory managed to link liberalism with the principle of democratic constitution of government, so that in his time (beginning of the 19th century) the idea on natural rights of the individual started to take root in the nation and it could only be emanated in a national state. Therefore modern ahistorical perception which puts liberalism into the sphere of multiculturalism and universalism opposite nationalism is completely inadequate. In a particular case, it does not allow an overview of the role of liberalism in constitution of modern Croatian nation and in creating conditions for establishment of the modern Croatian state, i.e.

real weakness of its influence. Therefore, a particular emphasis is given on the tenure of office of Vice-Roy (*ban*) Ivan Mažuranić (1873-1880) as it was the only period when liberal ideas took hold in Croatia until 2000.

In his paper “Challenges of the European Liberalism in the 19th, 20th and at the beginning of the 21st Century” Hans-Georg Fleck stresses the need to anticipate referential ideological determinants of liberalism as the main starting point in studying historical development of liberalism in Croatia. In this context he emphasizes that “motherhood” over wild capitalism on the one side and socialism on the other as well as social insensitivity was unjustly attributed to liberalism as already in the first stage of liberalism there were social programs for education, self-assistance and solidarity through associations. Here he points to complementarity of liberalism and nationalism in the West, whereas in Central and Eastern Europe liberalism and nationalism diverged. Finally, he established main modern challenges to liberal ideology in globalization trends.

The introductory treatise of Josip Vrandečić “Historical Determinants of Croatian Liberalism” establishes main causes of relative weakness of liberal tradition in Croatia in non-existence of ideal-typical followers of liberalism (apart from Imbro Tkalac), dependence of Croatia on external centers of power (Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade) and general “low tide of democracy” in the 20th century. Vrandečić also provides a chronological overview of the development of this tradition, from its very beginnings at the end of the 18th century, to rises and falls during the 19th century to a gradual disappearance in the interwar period and the final collapse by the establishment of Independent State of Croatia (NDH) and the Socialist Yugoslavia afterwards. The first decade of the Croatian independence was also marked by insensitivity for civic values, so that liberalism could finally achieve its affirmation after 2000.

Vrandečić begins the overview of the first half of the 19th century with the thinkers from bourgeois Croatia and Slavonia. Imbro Tkalac, the first of reformers, defines the period of French Illyrian provinces as a “model and just

administration which Croatia never, neither before nor afterwards, enjoyed” (59). Ljudevit Gaj’s *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavonskog pravopisanja* (Short Basis of Croatian-Slavonic Orthography, 1830) and Janko Drašković’s *Disertacija* (Dissertation, 1832) marked the symbolic beginning of the national reformation. Dragutin Rakovac in his book *Mali katekizam za velike ljude* (Short catechism for great people, 1842), laying stress on the right of each nation in a multi-national state to language and autonomous government modeled after Switzerland, uses the Illyrian name for the South Slavs only in linguistic terms, while in political terms he applies this term exclusively onto the area of triunity because “a brother does not tolerate his brother’s ruling” (77). In his paper dating from the same year, *Ilirisam i Kroatisam* (Illyrism and Croatism), Ljudevit Vukotinović emphasizes that “*Iliris-mus* (Illyrism) in political terms represents nothing”, while “*Kroatisam* (Croatism) on the other hand is our political life” (85), in the context of which the idea of pan-Slavism as a political construct turns out to be impossible and superfluous. Concurrently with the famous programmatic document of the Croatian Parliament (Sabor) *Zahtjevanja naroda* (Demands of the People) from 1848, Ivan Mažuranić with his *Manifest naroda Hrvatsko-Slavonskog* (Manifest of the Croatian-Slavonic people) achieved recognition as the first liberal thinker in Croatia who emphasized the precedence of natural right of the people as the basic prerequisite of emanation over the Croatian state law. Delivering a speech at the Croatian Parliament in 1861, Franjo Rački expressed his hope in restoration of the constitutional order, while Josip Juraj Strossmayer argued for establishment of a university and academy as means of enlightenment. However, only the writings of Ante Starčević managed to surpass the level of everyday political speech; in the Parliament’s petition on representatives’ immunity, Starčević inferred this immunity from the transfer of the supreme national sovereignty beyond which there is only God as a bestower of literacy because of which a man is entitled to write “anything he wants in the world” (123) (*O slobodi tiska*, On Freedom of Press). In his article *Stranke* (Parties) Starčević levels the Party of Rights with totality because “...in free states ... the people are divided into parties” (121),

and until the freedom is achieved “all the people are party” (121) as an expression of Rousseauian general will, while he perceives other parties in Croatia as personalized clubs. In the article *Ustavi Francezke* (Constitutions of France) Starčević justifies revolutionary terror by the need to preserve revolution from various enemies, and especially from the clergy which “on the strength of faith which they preach, they had every liberty to support and spread” (125). Milan Makanec, Ignjat Brlić, Fran Vrbanić and Hinko Hinković in their speeches delivered in the Parliament and their articles demand introduction of responsibility of the Vice-Roy (ban) to the Parliament, extension of electoral right, independent judiciary, restoration of the Mažuranić’s press courts and application of probation punishment.

The overview of the development of liberalism in Dalmatia begins with a report of the Governor of Illyrian provinces Vincenzo Dandolo to Napoleon from 1806 on the project of implementation of liberal imperial code in the province where “the population living outside towns hasn’t got houses” (154), and an “abundance of passions is driving the Dalmatians in towns” (154). Ivan Kreljanović Albinoni, the most distinguished intellectual in Dalmatia during the French administration, insists on education as the fundamental precondition for development. Medo Pucić in the article *Sačinjavamo li mi jednu naciju?* (Do we form a nation?, 1846) expounds an original idea on selfhood of nation only in national history, the preconditions of which are independence, freedom and nationality as “independence of sovereigns and princes”. Furthermore, he draws a very interesting conclusion, for that time and milieu, that “in the Western Europe, the majority of states are not mixed ... which does not cause any anxiety to the Westerners”, while “the great solution of the national issue will change the image of Central and Eastern Europe” (173). In the 1856 memorandum, Francesco Borelli appeals for linking Dalmatia with the Danube basin by rail network, while the most prominent members of the People’s Party Natko Nodilo, Miho Klaić and Lovro Monti insist on liberal reforms, harmonious co-existence of Croats, Serbs and Italians and unification of Dalmatia with Croatia, laying

stress on economic improvement as a prerequisite to enjoy political rights.

Istria is represented with the least number of liberal thinkers. Marko Baštijan in 1870 depicts the situation in Istria in the following way: “on the one side, there is haughty arrogance, and on the other crazy indifference, while on the both sides there is stupidity and poverty” (209), and together with Dinko Vitezić he argues for introduction of Croatian language into primary schools, while in the later stage of reformation Vjekoslav Spinčić and Matko Laginja insist on the freedom of national expression of Croats and Slovenians in Istria.

The second big part, reviewing the 20th century, begins with the writings of Antun Gustav Matoš which are probably the most interesting in the whole Chrestomathy. In *Hrvatskoj misli* (Croatian Thought) Matoš establishes the ethics of patriotism as a co-existence of positive and negative freedom. In this matter he strongly advises against the danger of Jacobin fulfillment of the political only by the means of ethical, while in the article *Ljudi i ljudi* (Men and Men) he proceeds from vulgarization of modern democracy as a by-product of aspiration of the Enlightenment to achieve the antic ideal. The article is concluded with a statement that “the aristocratic tendency of culture” (235), whose target is exclusively an individual, is possible to achieve only in the reformation of democracy towards a “real aristocratism of spirit and heart” (236). In the third article, *Ad zvecanum monachum*, he attacks fiercely the clericalism of the members of the True Right Party (*frankovci*) as a negation of the possibility of state formation of Croatia, because they “reject non-coreligionists from this formation” (237), and he adds that he perceives the struggle between “the red and the black” as a struggle between competitors and not of incommensurability. In his *Južnoslavenskom pitanju* (The South-Slav Question) as a reaction to the Declaration of the South-Slav Club from 1917, Milivoj Dežman points to the pragmatism at “street-politics level” as a main historical fault of Croatian liberal-national parties. Frano Supilo in his selected articles criticizes clericalism as the main opponent to the politics of “New

Course”, revealing how the clericals “...must be hundred times as greater patriots from the rest of us as only in this way is vulgarity deluded” (257). In his letter to Jovan Jovanović from 1917, Dežman explains the project of the future South-Slav community with common defense, financial, foreign, transport and university policy, while the rest would remain under the authority of federal units. Ante Trumbić in his speeches points to the principle of national independence as a prerequisite for the establishment of democratic order, while in the letter addressed to the *Manchester Guardian* from 1932, he describes in detail hegemonistic and anti-liberal constitution of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Stjepan Radić in the text *Liberalizam* (Liberalism) draws a conclusion on the equality of liberalism and patriotism basing it upon the theory of French thinker Faquet on co-existence of individual rights and positive demands of the state from its citizens. In other text entitled *Demokratizam* (Democratism), Radić perceives freedom as exercise of citizens’ rights, which he elaborated in detail in *Ustav neutralne seljačke republike Hrvatske* (The Constitution of the Neutral Peasant Republic of Croatia), “...to express their will ... to have that will carried out ... and that every citizen knows what is necessary and what is not” (280). The text *O razvoju demokratske misli* (On Evolvment of Democratic Thought, 1918), written by Law Professor Ladislav Polić, is probably the most founded writing in theoretical terms. In this text, Polić uses interpretations of Grotius, Rousseau, Sieyes, Fichte and Duguit to draw a conclusion on a rift between liberalism and democracy in emphasizing positive and negative aspect of freedom. However, the Polić’s basic thesis is developed on the notion that modern democracies are not being exhausted in their legal foundation, but that they supplement it by social and political foundation (which is along the lines of the later theory Franz Neumann on legal, cognitive and will element of political freedom).

In his lecture *Osnove modernog nazora o životu* (The Essentials of Modern Notion on Life), professor Albert Bazal, the founder of modern philosophical terminology in Croatia, teaches that just as the human life is a manifestation of obligations to an intellectual aim, which is implanted into a man through educa-

tion, so the people must “develop its special existence in all forms of culture...” in order to be included in the “history of mankind” (301). Marija Jurić Zagorka, founder of feminist movement in Croatia, insists on the need to achieve political equality with men by using examples of participation of women in the national movement. Press cutting from the articles written by journalist Josip Horvat depict the atmosphere of corruption and creeping military dictatorship in Croatia at the end of 1920’s, while sections from the Ivan Meštrović’s memoirs *Uspomene na političke ljude i događaje* (Memories of Political men and Events) and the Bogdan Radica’s memoirs *Živjeti, nedoživjeti* (To live, not live to see) evoke after-war revolutionary terror imposed by partisans. Fascism of the members of “Orjuna” (aggressive Yugoslav centralist-nationalist), dictatorship of the Ustasha movement and socialist revolution in Yugoslavia Radica brings under the common denominator of vertical revolt of the periphery against the center, i.e. violence of “semi-intelligent people of the Dinaric type” against bourgeois culture. Lawyer Ivo Politeo, famous for defending political defendants, prepared in 1954 *Kodeks profesionalne etike advokata* (Codex of Professional Ethics of Lawyers) for the International Lawyers Union, while economist Rudolf Bičanić analyzes the cycle of ideologically conditioned over-stretched quality of certain sectors in command economies which results in the collapse of economic system and the bloom of the black market. The last to be presented are *Programska načela HSLS-a* (Agenda Principles of Croatian Social-Liberal Party), the first party in the Croatian political history to have “liberal” in its name, as well as the writings of

Vlado Gotovac, who, apart from the writings of Matoš, are definitely the most attractive in this Chrestomathy. In his speech delivered in 1990, *Povratak pojedinca* (The Return of Individual), Gotovac perceives the greatest danger for human freedom in the attempt, which characterizes utopias, “to abolish the unpredictable” (355), which is why each individual has to subject all the political options to the test of refutation, while in social liberalism he sees a dam against egalitarianism of privation, but also against aggressive nationalism which only brings along a “possibility of repressive collectivism” (359). In the poetic essay *Vidljiva i nevidljiva Srednja Europa* (Visible and Invisible Central Europe), Gotovac argues in favor of Central Europe as an area of contacts among different nations and individuals between the radical anthropocentrism of the West and the abuse of the Hegel’s absolute spirit in the East.

Chrestomathy of Liberal Ideas in Croatia is a solid overview of the development of liberal thought in Croatia. Taking into account topicality, we find a drawback in the omission of some more distinguished liberals from the first half of the 20th century and some of a few liberals in emigration after the World War II. At any rate, the greatest value of the Chrestomathy is in opening the space for further comparative studies of the “process of civilizing” Croatia with respect to the Western Europe. This is extremely necessary taking into regard a small number of political science and historical studies on the tradition of liberal thought in Croatia.

Stevo Đurašković